



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IX.—*The Title of Caesar's Work on the Gallic and Civil Wars.*

BY PROF. FRANCIS W. KELSEY,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

IT is noteworthy that the two editors, Nipperdey and Meusel who in the last century contributed most to the criticism of the text of Caesar, adopted forms of the title of the Gallic War which are not only unlike but inconsistent with each other; and a third form is presented by Du Pontet, the editor of Caesar's text in the Oxford *Bibliotheca*, who combines elements that appear in the title as printed by the other two.

Nipperdey considers that the correct designation of Caesar's Civil and Gallic Wars taken together is *commentarii*, each separate book being a *commentarius*, with the characterizing part of the title in the ablative; the title-page of his large edition has *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii cum supplementis A. Hirtii et aliorum*, while at the beginning of the Gallic War we find *C. Iulii Caesaris de bello Gallico commentarius primus*. Meusel discards the word *commentarius*, plural as well as singular, adopting as the general title of the Gallic War *C. Iulii Caesaris belli Gallici libri VII*, and as the title of the first book *C. Iulii Caesaris belli Gallici liber primus*; he substitutes *liber* for *commentarius*, and has the genitive of *bellum Gallicum* in place of the ablative with *de*. Du Pontet uses *commentarii* as a common designation of the Gallic and Civil Wars, but *liber* of the individual books; at the beginning of the first book he has *C. Iuli Caesaris commentariorum de bello Gallico liber primus*.

To trace the variant forms of the title down from the *editio princeps* to the present time might be of interest in another connection, but no light would thus be shed on the question what title Caesar himself gave to these works. The cause of

the diversity lies farther back; the manuscript transmission of the title is hopelessly corrupt.

To begin with the codices of the *a* class, in the Moissac manuscript which, as the other good codices of the same class (with possibly a single exception), contains only the eight books of the Gallic War, this work is ascribed to Suetonius. The text of the Gallic War is preceded by a Latin version of a part of the *Antiquities of the Jews* by Josephus; the title of the Caesarian work immediately follows the subscription of the other, thus:

IOPPINI QVI ET IOSEPHI LIBER X
IVDAICE ANT QVITATIS EXPLICIT

INCIPIT LIBER SV
ETONII TRANQVILLI
VICTORIARVM
GAI IVLII CESARIS
MVLTIMODARVM
BELLI GALLICI

INCIPIT DE TRIMODA OMNIS
GALLIAE DIVISIONE

All this occupies a little less than a quarter of a page of the manuscript, which is written in a characteristic hand assigned by Châtelain (*Paléographie des Classiques lat.* I, p. 13) to the eleventh century; it fills out the greater part of the space left in the second column (each page being written in two columns) after the last sentence of the text of Josephus, and a new page is begun with the first word of Caesar's text, *Gallia*, which is provided with an elaborate initial letter. There is, however, no good reason to doubt that the title is of the same age as the rest of the manuscript.

The Amsterdam codex (Bongarsianus) has a double title: INCIPIT LIBER GAI CESARIS BELLI GALLICI IVLIANI DE NARRATIONE TEMPORVM; then, in red, INCIPIT LIBER SVETONII. The text of this manuscript in general agrees with that of the Moissac codex; the second part of the title, *Incipit liber*

Suetonii, is probably derived from the common ancestor of the two codices, which is designated by Meusel as χ . The parent codex very likely had the fuller form which we find in the Moissac manuscript, which was abbreviated in the Amsterdam codex to make room for the long first part of the title ascribing the work to Caesar, this being borrowed, as we shall see, from a manuscript of the other group of the α class, and inserted as a correction.

The other group of α manuscripts, best represented by Cod. Paris. Lat. 5763 (designated as B by the editors) and Cod. Vatic. 3864, assign the Gallic War to Caesar; the parent codex from which they were derived, designated by Meusel as ϕ , evidently had as title INCIPIVNT LIBRI GAI^I CAESARIS BELLI GALLICI IVLIANI DE NARRATIONE TEMPORVM. From this form evidently came the first part of the title in the Amsterdam codex, *Incipiunt libri* being changed to *Incipit liber* to accord with the second part of the title, *Incipit liber Suetonii*, derived from χ .

The manuscripts of the β class show less variation in the form of the title; the lost codex to which their origin is traced apparently had INCIPIVNT LIBRI GAI^I IVLII CAESARIS BELLI GALLICI DE NARRATIONE TEMPORVM.

With this last form before us it is possible to understand how the awkward *Iuliani* may have found its way into the title as it appears in the second group of manuscripts in the α class. Without entering into the question of the relative value of the α and β readings in constituting Caesar's text, we may suppose that a scribe or reader of a manuscript in the line of transmission between the archetype and the ϕ group had before him, either in his own manuscript or in another to which he had access, the title *libri Gaii Iulii Caesaris belli Gallici de narratione temporum*; that this seemed to him ambiguous or defective, because it does not necessarily assign the war as well as the literary work to Caesar; that he was familiar with the use of the adjective *Iulianus* with definite reference to Julius Caesar, as, for example, *de Bello Afr. 15 equites Iuliani, ibid. 78 turmas Iulianas, Cic. Phil. xiii, 31 vectigalia Iuliana*; that he

therefore corrected the title in his manuscript so as to read *libri Gaii Caesaris belli Gallici Iuliani de narratione temporum*, intending to convey the meaning, 'the books of Gaius (Julius) Caesar concerned with the recountal of the events of the Gallic War waged by Julius (Caesar)'; and that the manuscript thus corrected transmitted the changed title to its descendants. Such an explanation seems less improbable than that suggested by Hauler (*Wien. Stud.* XVII, p. 128), which accounts for *Iuliani de narratione temporum* as originating in a misunderstanding of the title CRONICA IVLII CAESARIS and the opening words of a fragment of the Cosmography of Aethicus Hister thus attributed to Caesar in Cod. Paris. suppl. 685; the same fragment immediately follows the eighth book of the Gallic War in Cod. Vatic. 3864.

As the beginning of the text of the Civil War is lacking in all the manuscripts, we find preceding this work a title of the simplest character, as INCIPIT LIBER PRIMVS BELLI CIVILIS. In the Ashburnham Codex appears DE BELLO CIVILI. INCIPIT LIBER NONVS (*Philologus*, XLV, p. 214); the first book of the Civil War (including Books i and ii of the current editions), immediately following the eighth of the Gallic War, is here reckoned as the ninth of the *Corpus Caesarianum*. In a manuscript in the British Museum (Addit. 10084, identified by Holder with Lovaniensis) the subscription of Book viii of the Gallic War and the title of the first book of the Civil War read as follows (cf. Châtelain, *op. cit.* p. 30): *C. Cesaris pontificis maximi ephemeris rerum gestarum belli gallici lib. VIII. expl. feliciter. Iulius Celsus Constantinus v.c. legi tantum. Incipit liber nonus.* Little help may be expected from this source for the solution of our problem.

Nor do the subscriptions of the other books yield much of value. The word *liber* constantly appears, but *commentarius*, so far as I am aware, only at the end of Book vii of the Gallic War, in certain manuscripts of the *a* class, as B: *Iulius Celsus Constantinus v. c. legi commentarius Caesaris liber septimus explicit.* The references to the revision of Julius Celsus Constantinus and of Flavius Licerius Firminus Lupicinus

(at the end of Book ii) raise interesting questions, but contribute no evidence bearing upon the authenticity of any part of the title. A detailed analysis of the subscriptions would be a waste of labor.

Whether the title *libri Gaii Iulii Caesaris belli Gallici de narratione temporum* descended from the archetype (X) into the α as well as the β manuscripts and in some codex in the line of descent to the χ group of the former class was replaced by a title attributing the Gallic War to Suetonius; or whether the first title was confined to the β class and was thence carried over, in a corrected form, to some codex in the line of descent to B and the other manuscripts of the ϕ group, there replacing a title, previously common to the α class, in which Suetonius was named as author; or whether, finally, the confusion in the forms of the title as they appear in the manuscripts is to be explained in some other way,—it is not necessary, so far as our present problem is concerned, to inquire. It will be sufficient to observe that a title so un-Caesarian in both choice of words and manner of expression cannot possibly have come from the hand of the author. We are therefore justified in adopting another line of approach in order to ascertain, first, whether there is any evidence tending to show that Caesar published his Gallic War anonymously; and in the second place, whether, in case the evidence seems to indicate that it was provided with a title from the beginning, we are able to determine, with any degree of probability, what that title was.

If, as has frequently been assumed, Caesar wrote the Gallic War primarily in order to justify his career of conquest before his fellow countrymen, he might well have thought that something was to be gained by anonymous publication; for if a document containing a favorable view of one side of a controversy can be circulated without a knowledge of its source, it is more apt to be received without prejudice and so to carry greater weight than if it is known to have emanated from a conspicuous partisan. Furthermore, on the supposition that the work was intended to be circulated without the name of the author, we have an adequate explanation of the studied

self-repression of Caesar the writer in always using the third person when referring to Caesar the commander, a circumstance which in later times facilitated the circulation of the work under the name of Suetonius. On the other hand, though by the middle of the first century B.C. the book trade in Rome had begun to be well organized,—the references in Cicero's letters are sufficient proof,—if an author not wishing to avail himself of the services of professional copyists and booksellers had prepared a work for private distribution he would, as Dziatzko suggests (*Ausgewählte Kapitel des antiken Buchwesens*, p. 158), probably have sent the transcripts with a personal note or greeting to the recipients and would not have provided such gift copies with a formal title even though he had had no intention of concealing the authorship. The existence of early manuscripts of the Gallic War without a full title is conceivable, then, upon either of two hypotheses: that of anonymous publication, and that of private distribution; in the latter case, as there was nothing corresponding with our copyright laws, copies might begin to be multiplied and offered for sale as soon as a bookseller should be able to get permission to transcribe one of the gift copies.

We know nothing of the circumstances and manner of composition of the Gallic War except what may be gleaned from internal evidence and from the statement of Hirtius in the preface to Book viii, that Caesar wrote his 'commentaries' with great ease and rapidity. According to the current view the work was composed in the winter of 52-51 B.C., and began to be circulated within a few months thereafter; the place of writing was Bibracte, where, as we learn from the closing chapter of Book vii, Caesar had resolved to spend the winter after the fall of Alesia. At Bibracte, his headquarters, the military records would be available in case he should wish to refresh his memory in regard to details; and though he heard cases there (viii, 4, 2), it might be presumed that he would be better able to command leisure for writing than when in the field or even when sojourning in Cisalpine Gaul. Nevertheless his winter in Bibracte was not unbroken. He could have been at most only a few weeks in camp when

he again took the field, on the last day of December, 52 (viii, 2, 1); since the date as given is according to the unreformed calendar, the real date must have been considerably earlier, probably in the first week of December according to our reckoning. Having chastised the Bituriges into complete submission, 'on the fortieth day' he was back in Bibracte. But after a sojourn of only eighteen days in camp (viii, 4, 3) he started out again, probably in the first half of February, 51, by our reckoning, and became involved in a series of operations which kept him occupied in various parts of Gaul till the end of the summer of 51.

In the winter of 51–50 B.C. Caesar established himself in Nemetocenna in Belgium, where, as we may understand from the narrative of Hirtius (viii, 49), not being disturbed by the necessity of campaigning, he was free to devote himself to the problems of civil organization and administration in anticipation of his departure from the country in the not remote future.

That the Gallic War left Caesar's hands before he went into winter quarters in the fall of 51 seems clear, not merely by reason of the oft-quoted favorable reference to Pompey in the seventh book (chap. 6), but also because he did not include the military operations of that year. While the fall of Alesia formed a literary as well as a military climax, the operations of the year 51 were nevertheless important enough to deserve treatment in any account of the campaigns in Gaul that was intended to be authoritative and complete. It would be easier for us to find time for Caesar to do the writing in the winter of 51–50 than in that of 52–51, and at least Holmes is of the opinion (*Conquest of Gaul*, p. 172) that, in view of Caesar's attitude of conciliation and politic forbearance toward Pompey, the sixth chapter of the seventh book might have been penned as late as the year 50. But for a man of Caesar's energy, literary training, and power of concentration, the composition of the Gallic War could have been no great task. The events narrated fall within the comparatively short period of seven years. They had been a part of his life -- he had analyzed situations, formed plans, directed movements,

secured results; in a word, he had that perfect understanding of his subject which no one else had or could ever attain. The work contains some forty-five thousand words, which would about equal the amount that a good newspaper writer, collecting his material from various sources and averaging fifteen hundred words a day, would hand in as "copy" in thirty days.

The more frequently the seven books of the Gallic War are read through in succession, the more irresistible will become the conviction that they were written under one impulse, that they could not have been composed at considerable intervals and put forth separately. Had they been written at the end of the year 51 or in 50, it is difficult to understand why Caesar should not have planned to add another book; and had he included in his design a book devoted to the events of the year 51, it is still more difficult to understand why he should not have been able to take three or four days to finish the task which he had so nearly completed. The explanation of Nipperdey (edition, p. 4) that he stopped at the end of Book vii because he was interrupted in the midst of writing by the beginning of the civil war, seems far-fetched. From the statement of Suetonius about the composition of the *de Analogia, Anticatones*, and *Iter (Div. Iul. 56)*; quoted p. 227) as well as the reference in Cicero's *Brutus* (253) to the preparation of the former work *in maximis occupationibus*, it is evident that Caesar wrote when the spirit moved him and did not wait for a favorable opportunity, for leisure and quiet, to finish what he had begun.

More probable is the supposition that, elated over the capture of Alesia, which he considered the decisive blow of the long struggle, appreciating better than his contemporaries the strategic value of his military operations, and understanding also what effect a better knowledge of them would produce at Rome, Caesar felt moved to write, and commenced the composition of the Gallic War in Bibracte shortly after he had gone into winter quarters there in the fall of 52; that, composing rapidly, he had completed a good part of the writing when he left camp, in December, to ravage the country

of the Bituriges; that after returning from this expedition, during the eighteen days spent in Bibracte, he either finished the work or brought it so near to completion that he was able to finish it while campaigning in the earlier months of 51. If there was a break in the composition caused by the strenuous expedition against the Bituriges, we might hazard a guess that it came at the end of Book iv; for the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth books seem to be less neatly joined than the corresponding parts of the other books.

In camp, however, whether at Bibracte or at Nemetocenna, the conditions were far from favorable for the composition of a finished historical work such as that of Thucydides, with which Caesar must have been familiar and of which he was perhaps a sympathetic reader. Burdened with executive duties, civil as well as military, when he essayed the task of composition he did not set before himself as an aim the writing of history, as in earlier life in composing orations he must have held in mind an ideal of oratory; rather he turned, as was natural under the circumstances, to the method of the annalists and attempted to set forth, in the simplest and most direct way, the events of each year in their chronological order, adding, however, such explanations as seemed to be needed. Fortunate from the beginning of the work in his perspective, which led him with unerring judgment to exclude irrelevant detail, a master of language in respect to conciseness as well as elegance of expression, he under such conditions, probably without realizing it himself, produced a literary masterpiece of the first rank. Regarding leisure as an indispensable condition of the writing of history, Caesar would probably have found himself in accord with Cicero (*de Leg.* i, 9): *historia vero nec institui potest nisi praeparato otio nec exiguo tempore absolvit.*

We are now in a position to understand how Cicero in the *Brutus* (262) could say that Caesar wished merely to furnish historical writers with a store of material on which they might draw, and could at the same time feel justified in lavishing unstinted praise upon the 'commentaries' as an example of

historical writing: Tum Brutus: 'Orationes quidem eius (Caesaris) mihi vehementer probantur; compluris autem legi; atque etiam commentarios quosdam scripsit rerum suarum.' 'Valde quidem,' inquam, 'probando; nudi enim sunt, recti et venusti, omni ornatu orationis tamquam veste detracta. Sed dum voluit alios habere parata, unde sumerent, qui vellet scribere historiam, ineptis gratum fortasse fecit, qui volent illa calamistris inurere; sanos quidem homines a scribendo deterruit. Nihil est enim in historia pura et lustri brevitate dulcior.'

Strikingly similar is the statement of Hirtius (viii, *praef.* 4, 5): Constat enim inter omnes nihil tam operose ab aliis esse perfectum quod non horum elegantia commentariorum supereretur. Qui sunt editi ne scientia tantarum rerum scriptoribus deesset, adeoque probantur omnium iudicio, ut *praerepta*, non *praebita*, facultas scriptoribus videatur. Notwithstanding the allusion in the earlier part of the preface to Caesar's writings treating of the Civil as well as those relating to the Gallic War, Hirtius seems here to have only the latter in mind; the bitterness of feeling toward Caesar, after the subduing of the Pompeian party, rendering a fair judgment of him and his works impossible on the part of a large body of citizens, not to mention the criticism of Asinius Pollio obviously referring to the Civil War (Suet. *Div. Iul.* 56; cf. Hor. *Od.* ii, 1), would make *probantur omnium iudicio* inapplicable to any 'commentaries' except those of the Gallic War; and possibly in *praerepta*, *non praebita facultas scriptoribus* we may catch an echo of a bon mot of some friend of Caesar's who epigrammatically expressed the contrast between the modest purpose and surpassing merit of that work. However that may be, from the references near the end of the preface to personal intimacy with Caesar and direct knowledge of events we can see that Hirtius was in a better position even than Cicero to judge what was Caesar's aim in writing. The agreement between Cicero and Hirtius in their appreciation of Caesar's *elegantia* has been pointed out by Woelflin (*Arch. f. lat. Lex. und Gram.* VIII, pp. 142-143).

This understanding of Caesar's purpose, to prepare a collection of historical facts rather than a formal history, is confirmed by the irregularity in the size of the different books, to which Birt directed attention in his well-known work (*Das antike Buchwesen*, pp. 339–340). The lengths of the books of the Gallic War are computed by Birt in lines as follows :

Book i.	1431	Book v.	1299
Book ii.	707	Book vi.	903
Book iii.	638	Book vii.	2073
Book iv.	813	Book viii.	1246 (incomplete)

The first book is thus seen to be more than twice as long as the second, while the third is only about half as long as the fifth, and one-third the length of the seventh, this in turn containing more than twice the number of lines in the sixth book. So wide a departure from well-understood conventions regarding the relative size of the books of a prose work, in the case of a writer so sensitive as Caesar was to literary form, is only explicable on the ground that, having adopted the annalistic method of arranging his material, he rigidly adhered to the plan of grouping all the events of each year in a single book, excluding from consideration any such arrangement of the matter of the whole work as should make possible a symmetrical division into books of the normal size. Hirtius, though writing a supplement to Caesar's work, thought it best, as he tells us, to abandon Caesar's plan of presenting the events of each year in a separate 'commentary,' and treated the events of two years (51 and 50) in a single book of moderate length because those of the second year needed only brief mention (viii, 48, 10): *Scio Caesarem singulorum annorum singulos commentarios confecisse; quod ego non existimavi mihi esse faciendum, propterea quod insequens annus, L. Paulo, C. Marcello consulibus, nullas res Galliae habet magno opere gestas. Ne quis tamen ignoraret, quibus in locis Caesar exercitusque eo tempore fuissent, pauca esse scribenda coniungendaque huic commentario statui.* In this passage Hirtius not only has *commentarios*, as in the preface,

referring to Caesar's work, but also uses the singular, *commentario*, instead of *libro*, when speaking of his addition.

We may now return to the question whether it is probable that Caesar either published the Gallic War anonymously or, having prepared it for private circulation, had only a comparatively small number of copies made for his friends, these copies not being provided with a regular title, but passed from hand to hand with the understanding that the work was Caesar's. To both alternatives a negative answer may safely be given. The language of Hirtius (p. 220) leaves no room for doubt that in his view the Gallic War, though not perhaps a history in the technical sense, was intended for general circulation as a literary work; and the words *qui sunt editi* imply that it was published, as books were ordinarily published at that time.

Let us assume for a moment that Caesar thought of putting forth the Gallic War anonymously; must he not have perceived that the frequent and convincing presentation of the motives of Caesar in connection with the operations of Caesar would stamp the work as his own in the face of any possible denial? Besides, he was too wise to resort to indirect methods when the employment of a direct method would better accomplish results; and while on the one hand the Gallic War was too serious a piece of composition to have been designed merely for the information or gratification of friends, in view of the trend of affairs at Rome it was on the other hand obviously to Caesar's interest to secure for the work immediately the largest possible circulation, and to lend to it the prestige of his name. The argument *ex silentio* is rarely of weight; yet one is tempted to remark that if the authorship of a work by so prominent a man appearing in a period of controversy had for any reason been a matter of doubt, it is singular that there is no evidence of a break in the literary tradition regarding the authorship till the beginning of the fifth century. It is not improbable that more than one copy of the Gallic War was sent from camp into Italy; but whether the friends receiving presentation copies were few or many, we may be sure that the work was at

once made accessible to the general public under the name of the author, its distribution being in every way encouraged and facilitated by Caesar's supporters. For while it was in reality, as in appearance, a dispassionate and authoritative narrative of events, it answered the purpose of a political pamphlet, being put forth at a time when the significance of the events treated was beginning to be fully appreciated in their bearing upon momentous issues affecting the existence of the Republic, when on the part of all, partisan and opponent alike, there was the keenest desire for information in regard to Caesar as well as affairs in Gaul. If then the Gallic War from the beginning must have had a title, we may next inquire what that title was.

The language of Cicero in regard to Caesar's 'commentaries' in the passage of the *Brutus* already quoted (p. 220) is so complimentary as to persuade Nipperdey that at the time of writing it he could not have seen the Civil War (edition, p. 5): 'Quod iudicium Ciceronem facturum fuisse, si iam tum libri de bello civili editi fuissent, incredibile est. In hoc enim bello tradendo certum est alia omnia requisisse Ciceronem, quam ut Caesaris narratio calamistris inureretur.' Nipperdey apparently overlooked the fact that in 46 B.C., the year of the publication of the *Brutus*, there was a temporary reconciliation between Caesar and Cicero, who in the address of thanks for the pardon of Marcus Marcellus in the autumn of that year expressed in glowing terms his admiration of Caesar's clemency and other good qualities, manifesting a disposition to judge him in all things without prejudice, as witness the following words (*pro Mar.* 31): *Ingratus est iniustusque civis, qui armorum periculo liberatus animum tamen retinet armatum, ut etiam ille melior sit, qui in acie cecidit, qui in causa animam profudit.* The sincerity of Cicero's feeling toward Caesar at this time, as Tyrrell and Purser have shown (*Correspondence of Cicero*, V, pp. xiv–xix) is revealed in his letters. However, on other grounds it is probable that the Civil War was not published until after Caesar's death, and by *commentarios* we may believe that Cicero meant the seven books of the Gallic War.

In this passage of the *Brutus* Cicero is either using the word *commentarios* as a descriptive term to characterize a work, known under some other name, in such a way that the reference will be plainly understood by his readers, or else he is quoting it as a title or part of a title. With regard to the significance of *commentarius* in Cicero's writings there is generally no uncertainty.

In the same *Brutus* we find *commentarii* used of records of the pontifices, perhaps a compilation of decrees or resolutions (55 ex pontificum commentariis); of other records, possibly family records (60 in veteribus commentariis, 72 in antiquis commentariis); and a neuter form *commentarium* (sc. *volumen*), of a summary of the points or heads of a speech amplified in delivery (164 *Ipsa illa censoria contra Cn. Domitium conlegam non est oratio, sed quasi capita rerum et orationis commentarium paulo plenius*). In a letter of Caelius to Cicero written in the year 50 b.c., *commentarius* is applied to a collection of memoranda relating to important events in the city which was sent to Cicero in Cilicia for his information (*ad. Fam. viii, 11, 4* *Quam quisque sententiam dixerit, in commentario est rerum urbanarum; ex quo tu, quae digna sunt, selige; multa transi . . .*); while in the *Philippics* the plural is used of Caesar's papers, documents and memoranda found after his death, both those that were really Caesar's (i, 2 *nihil tum, nisi quod erat notum omnibus, in C. Caesaris commentariis reperiebatur*) and those that Antony was accused of having forged (v, 11 *Decreta falsa vendebat, regna, civitates, immunitates in aes accepta pecunia iubebat incidi*. *Haec se ex commentariis Caesaris, quorum ipse auctor erat, agere dicebat*), and in a letter of Antony the singular occurs referring to a purpose or promise of Caesar expressed in a memorandum (*ad Att. xiv, 13, A. 2* *Quamquam videor debere tueri commentarium Caesaris*). In a letter to Lucceius (56 b.c. *ad Fam. v, 12*) Cicero urges a full treatment of the events of his consulship in the historical work upon which Lucceius was then engaged, offering, if he will undertake to do this, to furnish for the purpose *commentarios rerum omnium*, which can be nothing else than a col-

lection of notes and memoranda, the plural implying that these would be classified and arranged in series for convenience of reference.

These instances, and others that might be cited, illustrate the freedom with which the word *commentarius* was used in Caesar's time to designate sources or collections of material which a writer or speaker might utilize; the transition is easy to the use of the term in relation to literary works.

In 60 B.C. Cicero and Atticus, working independently, each finished about the same time an account of the events of Cicero's consulship, written in Greek. To both works the term *commentarius* was applied (*ad Att. i*, 19, 10 *Commentarium consulatus mei Graece compositum misi ad te*; *ii*, 1, 1 *Is mihi litteras abs te et commentarium consulatus mei Graece scriptum* [*i.e.* by Atticus] *reddidit*), and Cicero gives also the Greek name of his book as *ἱπόμνημα*. The precise character of these works cannot now be determined. In the letter last cited Cicero notes their similarity in respect to matter, humorously remarking that had he seen Atticus's book first he might have been accused of stealing. Nevertheless he criticises the style of Atticus, in a way that reminds us of the characterization of the style of Caesar's 'commentaries' in the *Brutus*: *Quamquam tua illa — legi enim libenter — horridula mihi atque incompta visa sunt, sed tamen erant ornata hoc ipso, quod ornamenta neglexerant, et, ut mulieres, ideo bene olere, quia nihil olebant, videbantur*; by contrast he jestingly speaks of his own book (*liber*) as perfumed and painted, but he adds that he sent a copy to Posidonius,—*ut ornatius de iisdem rebus scriberet*. It cannot be doubted that Cicero thought of *commentarius* as a part of the Latin form of the title of his book as well as Atticus's, even though in another letter he condenses the title into two words (*ad Att. i*, 20. 6 *De meis scriptis, misi ad te Graece perfectum consulatum meum*). He had a high ideal of the literary quality of history as distinguished from annals, as shown by the rambling but instructive passage in the *de Oratore* (ii, 51–58); and we shall probably not go astray if we suppose that he adopted *ἱπόμνημα, commentarius*, as a part

of his title because he designed the tract to be primarily a source book for Posidonius and other Greek writers; how anxious he was that his deeds should be commemorated in the writings of others is evident from the letter to Lucceius. The Greek Commentary was put into circulation so promptly that Atticus saw a copy at Corfu before he received from Cicero the carefully corrected presentation copy intended for him; and this was followed by the naïve request that if he liked it he should see that the work be well circulated in the Greek cities (*ad Att.* ii, 1. 2): *Tu, si tibi placuerit liber, curabis ut et Athenis sit et in ceteris oppidis Graeciae.*

Cicero makes reference also to *commentarii* (= ὑπομνήματα) of several Greek philosophers, as Aristotle, Cratippus, and Zeno; but he himself gives a clue to his conception of the significance of the term in such cases in the *de Finibus* (v, 12) *De summo autem bono quia duo genera librorum sunt, unum populariter scriptum, quod ἐξωτερικόν appellabant, alterum limatus, quod in commentariis reliquerunt, non semper idem dicere videntur.* From this we may understand that the *commentarii* were more technical books, containing perhaps outlines of lectures and similar material intended primarily for the use of the writer and his pupils and friends (cf. Madvig's *de Fin.*³, Excursus vii).

It seems evident that *commentarius* used by Cicero as a characterizing term would be referred to an assemblage of material lacking in literary quality. Since precisely this quality is predicated of the *commentarii* of Caesar, and since the term had already come into use in titles (p. 225), we may, I think, conclude that *commentarii* was a part of the title of the Gallic War as the work was known to Cicero, who was writing the *Brutus* within six years at most after it was published. Hirtius, as already noted, is consistent in the use of *commentarii* when referring to the same work.

Suetonius uses *commentarii* of both the Gallic and the Civil Wars (*Div. Jul.* 56): *Reliquit et rerum suarum commentarios Gallici civilisque belli Pompeiani. Nam Alexandrini Africique et Hispaniensis incertus auctor est; alii Oppium putant, alii Hirtium, qui etiam Gallici belli novissi-*

mum imperfectumque librum suppleverit. After quoting from Cicero and Hirtius, *de commentariis Caesaris*, and recording the criticism of Asinius Pollio, he adds: Reliquit et de Analogia duos libros et Anticatones totidem, ac praeterea poema quod inscribitur Iter. Quorum librorum primos in transitu Alpium, cum ex citeriore Gallia conventibus peractis ad exercitum rediret, sequentes sub tempus Mundinensis proeliī fecit; novissimum, dum ab urbe in Hispaniam ulteriorem quarto et vicesimo die pervenit. Though Suetonius uses *liber* as a descriptive term when referring to Hirtius's supplement to the Gallic War, it is not easy to see why, even with the passages of Cicero and Hirtius before him, he should consistently have used *commentarii* of Caesar's Gallic and Civil wars and *libri* of the other works of Caesar, unless consciously or unconsciously reflecting a difference in the titles of the works as they were known to him.

As a part of the title of the Gallic War *commentarii* must have been preceded by the name of the author in the genitive case, and followed by some word or phrase limiting its meaning; for the concept 'source book' or 'memoranda' suggests the question, "Of what?" We should expect to find the limiting word, if a noun, in the genitive. Aulus Gellius, to be sure, speaking of a family record (xiii, 20, 17) has *laudationes funebres et librum commentarium de familia Porcia*; but here *commentarium* is an adjective agreeing with *librum*, which is regularly used with the name of a work in the ablative, and elsewhere he not infrequently has a genitive, as *in commentariis lectionum antiquarum*, referring to a work by Caesellius Vindex (vi, 2, 1; xx, 2, 2); *commentariis harum noctium*, speaking of his own work which he professed to regard merely as a collection of excerpts (xviii, 4, 11); and *earum omnium rerum commentarios*, of the writings of Aristotle (xx, 5, 6). Cicero, Hirtius, and Suetonius, all have a genitive limiting *commentarii* referring to the works of Caesar; and this genitive will give us a clue to the remaining part of our title.

Cicero, in the *Brutus*, has *commentarios quosdam rerum suarum*; Hirtius, near the beginning of his preface, *Caesaris nostri commentarios rerum gestarum Galliae*; and Suetonius,

as we have seen, writes *rerum suarum commentarios Gallici civilisque belli Pompeiani*. While we know less about the sources and literary methods of Suetonius than we should like to know, it is, nevertheless, safe to say that his cast of mind was that of a grammarian rather than of a historian. In the case of one of Caesar's orations he took the pains to consult several copies (*Div. Iul.* 55 in quibusdam exemplari-
bus invenio . . .) in regard to a doubtful point; and it may be taken for granted that he had a first-hand acquaintance with the Dictator's other works. But if, as one familiar with the usage of some modern editors might assume, the titles of the Gallic and the Civil War in Suetonius's manuscripts were *commentarii Gallici belli* and *commentarii civilis belli*, why do we have *rerum suarum* in his descriptive phrase thrust into the construction between *commentarios* and *belli*? The answer is plain: he is using *rerum suarum*, as Cicero did, for *rerum suarum gestarum*, but he is not copying Cicero, because he writes with much more detail than Cicero does in the passage of the *Brutus* which he quotes in this connection; he is adapting the title *C. Iuli Caesaris commentarii rerum gestarum*, quoted by Hirtius as *Caesaris commentarios rerum gestarum*, so that it will form a part of a sentence and fit into his narrative. But what of *Gallici civilisque belli Pompeiani*?

The point of view of the student to whom the events of the end of the Republic appear in a distinct and colorless perspective is very different from that of a Roman of Caesar's time. Looking back upon the conquest of Gaul as an accomplished fact, we think of the Gallic War as a single series of operations, just as we think of the American Revolution, which lasted nearly as long, or even of the Thirty Years' War, though the impression of unity is perhaps less distinctly felt in the English designation of the last than in the German, *der dreissigjährige Krieg*. But there is nothing in Caesar's work to warrant the view that he would have used *Gallicum bellum* or *bellum Gallicum* as a part of his title.

The operations of Caesar in Gaul were directed against many peoples, differing as widely as Aquitanians from Galli, Galli from Germans, and Belgians from Britons. We are,

therefore, not surprised to notice that, in addition to the frequent employment of *bellum* in common idioms, he uses the word to designate a single campaign or definite and decisive movement against a particular enemy; when more than one campaign is thought of, he has the plural. Thus we find *bellum Helvetiorum* (*B.G.* i, 30, 1) of the campaign against the Helvetians; *Ariovisti bellum* (v, 55, 2) of the campaign against Ariovistus; *duo maxima bella* (i, 54, 2) of the campaigns against the Helvetians and against Ariovistus viewed as a single season's work; *bellum Venetorum* (iii, 16, 1), and *Veneticum bellum* (iii, 18, 6; iv, 21, 4) of the conquest of the maritime states; *Germanicum bellum* (iv, 16, 1) of the annihilation of the Usipetes and Tencteri; *Britannicum bellum* (v, 4, 1) of the second expedition to Britain; *bellum Treverorum et Ambiorigis* (vi, 5, 1) and *bellum Ambiorigis* (vi, 29, 4) of the operations against the Treveri and Ambiorix; *Gallica bella* (iv, 20, 1 quod omnibus fere Gallicis bellis hostibus nostris inde subministrata auxilia intellegebat) of all the campaigns of the first three years and the early part of the fourth; also, and especially to be noted, *Gallica bella* admitted by the editors in two passages of the Civil War where the reference is to all the campaigns in Gaul reckoned together: (iii, 2, 3) Atque eae ipsae copiae hoc infrequentiores imponuntur, quod multi Gallicis tot bellis defecerant; and (iii, 59, 1) Erant apud Caesarem equitum numero Allobroges II fratres . . . quorum opera Caesar omnibus Gallicis bellis optima fortissimaque erat usus. The singular *Gallicum bellum* occurs in one passage (*B.G.* v, 54, 4): . . . ut praeter Haeduos et Remos, quos praecipuo semper honore Caesar habuit, alteros pro vetere ac perpetua erga populum Romanum fide, alteros pro recentibus Gallici belli officiis, nulla fere civitas fuerit non suspecta nobis. The services referred to were rendered in the campaign of 57; their character may be inferred from the details given in Book ii, 3-6. There is no evidence that any help was received from the Remi in any other campaign prior to the latter part of the year 54, the period treated toward the end of Book v; 'the Gallic campaign' is then the campaign of the year 57, which is so designated to distinguish it from

the campaigns against the Helvetians and Ariovistus in 58 and the various operations of the years 56, 55, and 54.

The operations recorded in the Civil War, though widely extended, were in reality directed against a single enemy, and here, if anywhere, one might expect to meet with the singular *bellum* covering the entire series. But the campaign in 49 against Afranius and Petreius in Spain is called *maximum bellum* (iii, 47, 5); in Curio's address to his soldiers before Utica we find *Africum bellum* (ii, 32, 13), and at the end of the work, *bellum Alexandrinum* (iii, 112, 12). In the light of these passages it seems necessary to conclude that when in the third book Caesar writes *confecto bello* (as 57, 5) and *bello perfecto* (18, 5), he has in mind not the civil war as a whole, but the operations against Pompey in 48, on the east coast of the Adriatic and in Thessaly, which culminated in the battle of Pharsalus. Nor does he use *civile bellum* in such a way as to reflect the comprehensive signification required for a title. In one of the two passages in which the phrase is found, though the text is in an unsatisfactory condition, the reference is clearly to a state of civil war (ii, 29, 3); in the other (iii, 1, 4 qui se illi initio civilis belli obtulerant), the thought is of the breaking out of hostilities between citizens, 'at the commencement of civil strife,' rather than of the civil war as a historical unity; in *ante bellum* (iii, 1, 2) the sense more nearly approaches that of *bellum* in titles. Caesar seems to avoid the use of *civile bellum*, as he sought to avoid the war itself; so in the letter in which he tried to persuade Cicero, after hostilities had commenced, to remain neutral, mild phrases are used instead (Cic. *ad Att.* x, 8, b. 2): Postremo, quid viro bono et quieto et bono civi magis convenit quam abesse a civilibus controversiis? . . . neque tutius neque honestius reperies quicquam quam ab omni contentione abesse. In the Civil War *civilis dissensio* also occurs (i, 67, 3; cf. iii, 1, 3).

When Caesar wrote the Gallic War the events of the civil war were yet in the future. Still, apart from the evidence furnished by an examination of his usage, we may well question whether he would have thought it expedient to use *bellum*

in the title of this work, even in the plural. His appointment in Gaul, as in the case of other proconsuls, included civil as well as military functions; and, though in his administration deeds of war overshadowed and obscured the deeds of peace, it must be remembered that his career of conquest had been sharply criticised and even viewed with alarm at Rome. He was not so lacking in tact as to characterize the work in which he gave to the Roman people an account of his stewardship by a term exclusively, to some offensively, military. A chief distinction of the Gallic War as a narrative of events at the same time truthful and favorable to the author, lies in the skill with which Caesar the writer unobtrusively leads the reader, step by step, to see how Caesar the proconsul, in order to protect the interests which Rome already had in Gaul, was obliged to carry the work of conquering on from one stage to another until the whole country was subdued. The case is still stronger against the use of *civile bellum* as a part of the original title of the Civil War; even Hirtius in his preface avoids a phrase of so unpleasant associations, and instead has *civilis dissensio*, though he does not hesitate to speak of the Alexandrine and African "wars" both separately and together (*Mihi ne illud quidem accidit, ut Alexandrino atque Africano bello interessem; quae bella . . .*).

But with *rerum gestarum* in the title of the Gallic War, there was no need of *Gallici belli* or another phrase to define the scope of the work more closely. Caesar uses *res gestae*, as also *res gesta*, with almost a complete blending of noun and verb concepts to express a single idea, as *B.C.* ii, 31, 3 Quasi non et felicitas rerum gestarum exercitus benevolentiam imperatoribus et res adversae odia concilient! *Ibid.* iii, 106, 3 Sed Caesar confisus fama rerum gestarum infirmis auxiliis proficisci non dubitaverat aequa omnem sibi locum tutum fore existimans; *B.G.* v, 47, 4 Labienus interitu Sabini et caede cohortium cognita . . . rem gestam in Eburonibus perscribit. An indication of the content of *res gestae* in Caesar's mind is given in the same speech of Curio, previously quoted (*B.C.* ii, 32, 5): An vero in Hispania res gestas Caesaris non audistis? duos pulsos exercitus? duos superatos

duces? duas receptas provincias? haec acta diebus XL, quibus in conspectum adversariorum venerit Caesar? The associations of the phrase in these passages are military, except in so far as the allusion to the recovery of the two provinces may imply civil reorganization. More clear is the extension of *res gestae* to civil administration in various passages of Cicero, as in *Pis. 72 res gestas consulatus mei*; in the Marcellus, *res tuae gestae*, spoken in the laudation of Caesar, and including not only his military successes (4, 5) but also his plans for the rehabilitation of the state (25 omnium salutem civium cunctamque rem publicam res tuae gestae complexae sunt; tantum abes a perfectione maximorum operum, ut fundamenta nondum quae cogitas ieceris), seems almost like an echo from the title of his work, a play upon words by no means unpleasing to him to whom the speech was addressed; still Cicero uses the phrase frequently elsewhere, and none was more fitting. How *Gallici belli* came to be added to the title after Caesar's time involves the consideration of the formation and history of the *Corpus Caesarianum*, a subject that will be touched upon later.

In the quotation from Curio's address in the last paragraph the field of Caesar's operations is designated by *in Hispania*. Does *Galliae* in Hirtius's *Caesaris commentarios rerum gestarum Galliae* reflect a geographical designation in the original title? I think not; for if Caesar had added *in Gallia* to his title it would have been more natural for Hirtius to use this than the difficult *Galliae*, the authenticity of which has been questioned, though on insufficient grounds (cf. viii, 48, 10 *res Galliae gestas*). When the Gallic War was published no word was needed to indicate the field of operations, known to all and besides defined in the opening sentences of the first book; and Caesar was not the man to waste words, least of all in a title. Hirtius, having completed a supplement to the Gallic War and bridged the gap between it and the Civil War, was obliged in some way to distinguish the books of the former from those of the latter.

In the fragments of the work of Sempronius Asellio preserved by Aulus Gellius (v, 18) the difference is pointed out

between *annales* and *res gestae* as species of historical composition; and it is probable that *res gestae* appeared in the title of his work, at least in the copy from which Gellius made excerpts (cf. Gell. ii, 13, 2; iv, 9, 12; xiii, 22, 8), though he is cited a few times by the grammarians with the title *historiae*. In Caesar's youth then the distinction was already made that in the composition of *res gestae* it was not enough to tell what was done, *sed etiam quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent*. It is a fair inference from the words of Gellius (ii, 13, 3) *Is Asellio sub P. Scipione Africano tribunus militum ad Numantiam fuit resque eas, quibus gerendis ipse interfuit, conscripsit*), that the *res gestae* of Asellio, dealing with events of which he had personal knowledge, contained an autobiographical element. The forerunner of Caesar in this species of composition, however, was not Asellio but Sulla. The title of Sulla's memoirs has been restored by Peter with good reason as *commentarii rerum gestarum* (*Hist. Rom. Rel.* p. cclxxviii); and Plutarch at least believed that Sulla intended the work to be a source book rather than a history, as is indicated by the surprising statement in his *Lucullus* (i): 'Ο δὲ Λούκουλλος ἤσκητο καὶ λέγειν ἵκανῶς ἐκατέραν γλώτταν, ὥστε καὶ Σύλλας τὰς αὐτοῦ πράξεις ἀναγράφων ἐκείνῳ προσεφώνησαν ὡς συνταξομένῳ καὶ διαθήσοντι τὴν ιστορίαν ἄμεινον.'

The designation of Caesar's books relating to the Gallic War as *commentarii rerum gestarum* was not only appropriate but had the support of literary precedent. From the brevity and directness with which he was wont to express himself, it might be inferred that in the title of the exemplar prepared for the copyists he would have given his own name as *Caesaris* rather than in full. Outside the circle of personal friends however, such a use of the name might have seemed to smack of presumption; it is safer to conclude that the original title was:

C. IVLI CAESARIS COMMENTARII RERVM GESTARVM

There yet remain the questions of the designation of the individual books; of the loss of the original title and the origin of those found in the manuscripts, as well as of

the secondary titles used by Suetonius; and as bearing upon the choice of a title, the point of view of both Greek and Roman writers with reference to the place of personal narrative in relation to other forms of historical composition. The limitations of this paper make it impracticable to follow out these or other lines of inquiry here; but it may be worth while to outline what may be considered as on the whole a not improbable explanation of the way in which the titles of both the Gallic and the Civil Wars came to be as they are.

I.

Caesar wrote the seven books of the Gallic War rapidly, arranging the material by years and numbering the rolls (*volumina*) I to VII as he finished them, so as to indicate the order; referring back when necessary to preceding portions of the work by memory, and using indefinite references (as *ut* or *ut ante* or *ut supra demonstravimus*, *ut* or *ut supra demonstratum est*) instead of the more definite references ordinarily used by writers who make a greater labor of composition and write more deliberately. Thus Hirtius, referring to Caesar's Book vii, has *superiore commentario* (viii, 4, 3; 30, 1; 38, 3).

Avoiding the use of definite references, he had no occasion to employ in his text a word referring to an individual book; had he done so, we may suppose that, consistently with his use of the plural *commentarii* and with the usage exemplified by Hirtius, he would have chosen *commentarius* instead of *liber*, and that this word would have been supplied by him with the numeral adjective had he thought it necessary to designate the separate books by formal inscriptions (as *commentarius tertius*) instead of the simple numbers.

2.

At some time between the end of the year 48 and March of 44 (probably after July, 46), encouraged by the reception of his *commentarii* i-vii, and desiring for many reasons to put into circulation a summary of the events of the Civil War from his own point of view, Caesar undertook to continue the work;

though harried and worn and interrupted, he succeeded in completing (probably by dictation) two rolls, of which the first contained an account of the events of the year 49 and included Books i and ii, as the work is divided in modern editions, while the second treated the events of 48, being Book iii of the editions. It may be that he expected at some future time to write an account of the events of 51 and 50; but the battle of Pharsalus, as the fall of Alesia, marked a climax and turning-point of his fortunes, and taking up first that which was most important, he commenced the first of the new rolls with the negotiations at the beginning of January, 49, from which the course of events led rapidly and naturally to Pharsalus and Egypt; circumstances did not permit him to carry the narrative beyond the beginnings of the Alexandrian War. The two rolls that were finished may have been numbered X and XI, space being left in the enumeration for two other rolls covering the events of 51 and 50; or possibly they were numbered VIII and IX to follow immediately the first series.

After Caesar's death either his trusted friend Cornelius Balbus, to whom he had committed the charge of important interests when absent from Rome, or Aulus Hirtius, obtained possession of the two finished rolls. Balbus, desiring out of regard for Caesar's memory not to allow them to be published without a presentation, from Caesar's point of view, of the events immediately preceding and following those of 49 and 48, persuaded Hirtius to fill out the missing portions of the *commentarii* (*B.G.* viii, *praef.* 1, 2).

3.

Hirtius, troubled by ill health and pressed by many affairs, nevertheless found time to finish and send to Balbus, with a dedicatory preface, an account of the events of the years 51 and 50, so bridging the chasm between the old *commentarii* and the new; the final revision and transmission to Balbus of the latter part of his work, continuing his narrative to the death of Caesar, may have been prevented by his own death, only a year after that of the Dictator.

The *commentarius* covering the events of 51 and 50 was viewed by Hirtius as something interjected into the writings of Caesar (*praef.* 3 qui me mediis interposuerim Caesaris scriptis); either Hirtius or Balbus (probably the latter) arranged in order a copy of the first seven *commentarii*, the interjected roll of Hirtius, and the two new rolls left by Caesar, so as to make an orderly collection of the whole as follows:

ROLL	YEAR	AUTHOR
I-VII	58-52	Caesar
VIII	51 and 50	Hirtius
IX	49	Caesar (Books i and ii of the Civil War as it appears in the editions)
X	48	Caesar (Book iii of the Civil War in the editions)

All these were included under the general title *C. Iuli Caesaris commentarii rerum gestarum*; the question of the authorship and addition of the Alexandrian, African, and Spanish Wars need not be raised here. The eighth roll had a special inscription, in which the word *commentarius* and the name of Hirtius appeared; traces of this special inscription, in a corrupt form, are found in certain manuscripts, as are also traces of the original numbering of the books.

4.

Strabo knew Caesar's *commentarii* (*ὑπομνήματα*) as only a single work; he refers to the Gallic War under the general title (iv, 1 οὗτω δὲ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Καῖσαρ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν εἴρηκεν). But the subject-matter was so sharply differentiated that the rolls composing the work naturally came to be reckoned in two groups, those relating to the Gallic War and those relating to the Civil War. Livy in his own work recognizes a similar grouping of the books relative to the Samnite Wars (x, 31, 10). To the readers of a work written in rolls the grouping of books related in subject-matter was even more a matter of convenience than with us, who use a different kind of volume.

The two groups of Caesar's *commentarii* were probably offered for sale separately by the booksellers. By the time of Suetonius the division of the work into two parts was so generally recognized that to his adaptation of the title, *rerum suarum commentarii*, he added as epexegetical secondary titles *Gallici civilisque belli Pompeiani*, the adjective *Pompeiani* being added to indicate that Caesar's own books on the Civil War, as distinguished from the continuations mentioned in the next sentence, covered only the struggle with Pompey. The continuations known to Suetonius were apparently the same as those which we have; they were probably arranged as they appear in the Ashburnham manuscript, the Alexandrian War being numbered XI, the African War XII, and the Spanish War XIII.

5.

The thirteen rolls of the Caesarian corpus in their proper order were copied into a manuscript of the ordinary codex form, each roll being of course reckoned a separate book (*liber*). This codex, or an early descendant, became badly worn. The parts which suffered most were the first page, the last page, and the page containing the opening sentences of Book ix, to which, as the beginning of the Civil War, those looking at the manuscript would turn more frequently than to any other part between the two covers. At last the leaves on which were these pages became loose and disappeared; thus were lost the first page containing the title, which was usually put on the first page of a codex (Aug. *Ep.* 40, 2, *Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.* XXXIV, 2, p. 71; cited by Dziatzko, *Ausg. Kapitel des ant. Buchwesens*, p. 179), a leaf containing the end of Book viii and the beginning of Book ix, and one or more leaves with the end of the Spanish War. Of the origin of other lacunae it is not necessary here to speak.

6.

From this mutilated codex came at least three descendants to all of which titles were supplied:

- a. In one copy, by an error easily explicable, the new title

assigned the work to Suetonius; descendants of this exemplar, or the exemplar itself, were used in the fifth century by Orosius (cf. vi, 7, 2 and *Jahresberichte des phil. Vereins zu Berlin*, 1885, pp. 154–156) and Apollinaris Sidonius (*Ep.* ix, 14, 7 *opera Suetonii = opera Caesaris*).

b. In another copy, though the work was recognized as Caesar's, *Ephemeris Gaii Iulii Caesaris* or *C. Iulii Caesaris* was supplied as a title by some reader of Plutarch's life of Caesar (22 ὁ μὲν Καῖσαρ ἐν ταῖς ἑφημερίσι γέγραφεν) or a similar Greek source now lost; this manuscript or a descendant of it was used by Symmachus in the year 396 (*Ep.* iv, 18, 5 Sume ephemeridem C. Caesaris decerp tam bibliotheculae meae, ut tibi muneri mitteretur).

c. In the third copy, which was in the line of descent to the archetype of all existing manuscripts, *libri Gaii Iulii Caesaris* was supplied as a general title, and then *de narratione temporum belli Gallici*, or something similar, was added as a secondary title of Books i–viii; hence came the form of the title which appears in the β manuscripts. As the beginning of Book ix had disappeared, one of the scribes who copied from the archetype (X) or from the princeps of the β class, noticing that this book commenced a new subject, supplied a form of *bellum civile* as a title, divided the book into two parts, numbering these as Books i and ii of a separate work, and changing the number of Book x to iii; hence the division of the Civil War as it is found in most manuscripts.

7.

The variant forms of the titles of Caesar's work found in the manuscripts and in the early editions may all be explained as arising in part from the acquaintance of scribes and editors with more than one manuscript, and in part from attempts to restore the ancient title from literary sources.